

This is a large undertaking in a field where close observation and verification are difficult or impossible to achieve. It is inevitable, therefore, that many of the questions posed by the volume must be met by surmise rather than documentation, but in terms of their stated rationale the authors have done well. The book will be of great value to policy makers and should be read by every person who seeks to keep himself informed on developments in Asia.

The book begins with a relatively short narrative and interpretation of major developments in modern Chinese history—the crumbling of the Manchu empire, the development of the Kuomintang, the rise of the Communist movement, and the eventual victory of Mao Tse-tung and his associates. The following section concerns itself with the evolution of Communist policy from its revolutionary roots through the New General Line of 1953–1954.

Against this background, the authors proceed with their analyses of the relation between the Chinese Communist regime and the people it rules; the nature of the Sino-Soviet alliance; the changes which the Peking regime has wrought in the Chinese economy, together with conditions and prospects for future economic growth; and the prospects for Communist China in terms of its top leadership, inner strength and weaknesses, and tactical goals.

After a judicious balancing of Chinese Communist strengths and weaknesses, the authors conclude that despite unfocused popular discontent within its borders, the Peking government maintains instruments of central and internal unity sufficient to keep its power secure. The regime's future stability, in turn, will depend largely upon four related factors—the policy and performance of Soviet Russia, Communist success in competition with Free Asia, the Peking government's progress in industrialization, and the unity and continuity of its top leadership.

In gathering the material from which these various analyses are drawn, the authors have surveyed and interpreted a large part of the research materials available on modern China. The historical section is not as strong as the accessible data should have made possible, but in their probing of contemporary China the authors have proceeded with imagination and deftness. Here one regrets only that sufficient distinction is not always made between assertions that are supported by evidence and those which remain essentially hypothetical.

It should be pointed out that two chapters—those dealing with economic reconstruction and control and with conditions and prospects for economic growth—differ from most of the other parts of the book in that they present material which is, to a large degree, a new contribution to knowledge.

ROBERT C. NORTH.

Hoover Institute.

A Study of Bolshevism. BY NATHAN LEITES. (Glencoe: The Free Press. 1903. Pp. 639. \$6.50.)

Ritual of Liquidation: The Case of the Moscow Trials. BY NATHAN LEITES AND ELSA BERNAUT. (Glencoe: The Free Press. 1954. Pp. xi, 515. \$6.50.)

These studies, sponsored by the RAND Corporation, constitute major additions to our understanding of Bolshevik thought and action.

Democratic statesmen, casual visitors, engineers, and foreign Communists—each in his varied but limited contact with Soviet society and politics—have been driven by their experiences sooner or later to reflect on the peculiar modes of thought displayed by the Bolsheviks with whom they happen to deal. At times Soviet wielders of some authority seem, even charmingly and disarmingly, like human beings from other cultures of our time; or, more frequently, they assert aggressively the absolute demands of their ideology and system, as if they feared to question any part or detail. These and similar observations crop up constantly in any report on “dealing with the Russians.” It has remained for a talented, imaginative and indefatigable investigator, Nathan Leites, to undertake to embrace the entire body of Bolshevik thought and motivations in *A Study of Bolshevism* and thus to make explicit the interplay of doctrine and action within the Soviet system.

Many observers have been struck by the Soviet emphasis on the “party line” as the only correct though wavering median between incorrect opposites. And many have commented on the party’s alternate insistence on remaining true to a rigid program and on exercising leadership over the non-party masses for purposes not shared by those “masses.” The combination of a belief in determinism with an extreme tension of will, coupled with a fear of failure and annihilation, has also been found, in some measure, in Islam, in periods of expansion. The functions of resistance, attack, retreat, and temporary compromise have their parallels in classical military strategy. What is unique in Leites’ analysis is the masterful way in which he has identified, as though from within the Bolshevik mind, the general range of aims, techniques, and situations which Bolsheviks are trained to expect and to cope with.

Perhaps to ward off some unjustified criticisms of his earlier summary of Bolshevik thinking (*The Operational Code of the Politburo*, 1951), Leites emphasizes that his present work cannot serve to predict a Soviet choice of policy in any given situation. He need not be embarrassed at having progressed so short a distance toward the science of prediction in human affairs! It will be sufficient if at least several tens of thousands of experts and commentators, concerned in some degree with analyzing and predicting Soviet actions, take advantage of this unique guide to the nature of the Bolshevik way of thinking.

Ritual of Liquidation studies a special and important application of the Bolshevik way of thought. By definition, this investigation by Leites and Bernaut is concentrated on the “demonstration trials,” which have been organized periodically by the Soviet regime and its satellites. Although the great climax of trials came in 1936–38, with the self-castigation exacted by Stalin from many of his former rivals for power, the authors rightly draw the parallel between these major Soviet trials and the Rajk, Kostov, and Beria trials since 1948. If the psychology which dictated the origin, course, and outcome of the “liquidation trials” should appear remote in time, it is only necessary to recall that, arriving at Belgrade in May, 1955, Khrushchev promptly and eagerly

disclosed that the entire Soviet "misunderstanding" with Tito, since June, 1948, had been due to the "fabrications" cooked up by Beria and Abakumov, acting as "enemies of the people" and "agents of imperialism."

Ritual of Liquidation examines with great precision the purposes and methods of the political trial within the Bolshevik system. It unravels with delicacy the confusion between thought and word, word and action, action and effect. Possibly it over-intellectualizes the motives of those "Old Bolsheviks" who accepted the "deal" and became, in part, cooperative partners in the judicial spectacle. How far "over-compliance" by the accused with the demands of the prosecutor for self-abasement was actually understood by those present as a tacit rejection of the accusation remains doubtful; those who remembered the pre-Stalinist version of Bolshevik history were by then few, weak, and afraid.

One small detail: Stefanov, the second most important victim of the Sofia trial of 1949, may or may not have been "a prominent illegal Party member" from 1932 to 1935. In any case, he was, at that time, legally and publicly, the Assistant Director of the Statistical Bureau of the Kingdom of Bulgaria, which published very extensive and competent reports on all aspects of the Bulgarian economy. Since little if any of this information was "secret," Stefanov was presumably engaged in carrying out his administrative duties by furnishing information to visitors requesting it (p. 362), rather than serving as an "agent of British Intelligence."

PHILLIP E. MOSELY.

Columbia University.

Federalism: Mature and Emergent. EDITED BY ARTHUR W. MACMAHON. (Garden City: Doubleday and Co. 1955. Pp. xi. 557. \$7.50.)

This symposium is one of a series that diffuses the benefits of the bicentennial conferences held at Columbia University. It brings together essays by twenty-two distinguished contributors, economists and lawyers as well as political scientists. Perhaps not since the *Federalist* papers has so much insight, wisdom and breadth of perspective on the subject been compacted in a single volume.

Federalism is a loose concept. Its essential tests are all matters of degree and its practical manifestations are numberless. This symposium, for all its penetration into detail, is therefore appropriately selective rather than encyclopedic. Part I, on the nature and role of federalism, groups five essays broadly introductory: a masterly survey by the editor, pointing up the inherent paradox of nationalizing impulses that operate both cohesively and divisively; a reflective review of British commonwealth and colonial experience by K. C. Wheare, who suggests that the will or willingness to try to form a new and more inclusive nationality is the basic test of the practicability of federalism; a note of doubt from the late Franz Neumann as to whether federalism has any inherent advantages over unitary systems for promoting freedom; an emphasis by John Fischer on the need for balanced powers and concurrent majorities if federalism is to work satisfactorily; and a reminder from Adolf Berle, Jr. (who seems to